

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

**CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

**I. (a) PLAINTIFFS**

HELEN SWARTZ, Individually

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Miami-Dade County, FL  
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)  
David S. Dessen, Dessen, Moses & Rossito, 600 Easton Rd, Willow Grove, PA 19090, 215.496.2902 & Fuller, Fuller & Assoc., 12000 Biscayne Blvd, N. Miami, FL 33181, 305.891.5199 [PHV pending]

**DEFENDANTS**

RADNOR HOTEL ASSOCIATES, a Pennsylvania Limited Partnership

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant \_\_\_\_\_  
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

**II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☒ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

**III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES** (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- |   | PTF                        | DEF                        |   | PTF                        | DEF                        |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State                   | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State     | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State                | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation  | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

**IV. NATURE OF SUIT** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.](#)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability <b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))
<b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<b>PRISONER PETITIONS</b> <b>Habeas Corpus:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <b>Other:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act <b>IMMIGRATION</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
<b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609				

**V. ORIGIN** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding
- ☐ 2 Removed from State Court
- ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
- ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened
- ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)
- ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer
- ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION**

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):  
**Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC Sec. 12181, et seq.**  
 Brief description of cause:  
**Equal access to places of public accommodation for persons with disabilities**

**VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:**

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$ \_\_\_\_\_

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  
 JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☒ No

**VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY**

(See instructions):

JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_

DOCKET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

DATE

SIGNATURE OF A TORNEY OF RECORD

APRIL 5, 2021

[Signature]

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # \_\_\_\_\_

AMOUNT \_\_\_\_\_

APPLYING IFP \_\_\_\_\_

JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_

MAG. JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HELEN SWARTZ, Individually,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.

RADNOR HOTEL ASSOCIATES,  
a Pennsylvania Limited Partnership,

Defendant.

---

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ, Individually, on her behalf and on behalf of all other mobility-impaired individuals similarly-situated, (sometimes referred to as “Plaintiff”), hereby sues the Defendant, RADNOR HOTEL ASSOCIATES, a Pennsylvania Limited Partnership (sometimes referred to as “Defendant”) for Injunctive Relief, and attorney’s fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq. (“ADA”).

1. Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ, resides in Miami Beach, Florida, in the County of Miami-Dade.

2. Defendant’s property, The Radnor Hotel, is located at 591 E. Lancaster Avenue, St. Davids, PA, in the County of Delaware.

3. Venue is properly located in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania because venue lies in the judicial district of the property situs. The Defendant's property is located in and does business within this judicial district.

4. Pursuant to 28 USC § 1331 and 28 USC § 1343, this Court has been given original jurisdiction over actions which arise from the Defendant's violations of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq. See, also, 28 USC § 2201 and § 2202.

5. Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ is a Florida resident, is sui juris, has multiple sclerosis and relies on the use of an electric scooter to ambulate, as she is mobility impaired. She qualifies as a person with disabilities, as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Helen Swartz was born and raised in New York City and moved to the Philadelphia area in 1978 to attend graduate school. After completion of her studies, she founded a business and resided in the area until 2011. She was active in the business community and has many long-standing relationships that she has maintained throughout the years. She also had two children during those years, through which she knew many people.

Helen Swartz visited the property which forms the basis of this lawsuit from March 5 through March 6, 2021, and has reservations to return to the property on August 26 through August 27, 2021, to meet her daughter and

granddaughter to shop at King of Prussia Mall and have dinner, and also to avail herself of the goods and services offered to the public at the property, if the facilities are fully accessible and the barriers to access have been corrected. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers at the subject property, which have impaired her use of the facilities and the amenities offered, and have endangered her safety at the facilities and her ability to access the facilities the property has to offer and use the restrooms.

6. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers at the subject property, which are enumerated in paragraph 10. The barriers to access at the property have endangered her safety, and adversely affected her ability to use the facilities.

7. Defendant owns, leases, leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201(a) and 36.104. Defendant is responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that the Defendant owns, operates, leases or leases to is known as The Radnor Hotel, and is located at 591 E. Lancaster Avenue, St. Davids, PA 19103, in the County of Delaware.

8. HELEN SWARTZ has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA with

respect to this property as described but not necessarily limited to the allegations in Paragraph 10 of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that she will continue to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the ADA by the Defendant. HELEN SWARTZ desires to visit The Radnor Hotel not only to avail herself of the goods and services available at the property but to assure herself that this property is in compliance with the ADA so that she and others similarly-situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the property without fear of discrimination.

9. The Defendant has discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying her access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the hotel, as prohibited by 42 USC § 12182 et seq.

10. The Defendant has discriminated, and is continuing to discriminate, against the Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing to, inter alia, have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A preliminary inspection of The Radnor Hotel has shown that violations exist. These violations which HELEN SWARTZ personally observed or encountered, and which were verified by an ADA expert, include, but are not limited to:

- a. The hotel does not provide the required amount of compliant

accessible guest rooms, and the accessible rooms are not dispersed among the various classes of accommodations. This is in violation of Section 224 the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This denies to Plaintiff the full and equal opportunity to stay at the subject hotel. 28 CFR §36.302(e)(1).

b. The accessible features of the facility are not maintained, creating barriers to access for the Plaintiff, as set forth herein, in violation of 28 CFR §36.211.

c. The access aisle does not adjoin an accessible route to the site. This is in violation of section 502.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff access to the facility.

d. Parking space identification is missing from some of the accessible parking spaces. This is in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff access to the facility.

e. In the accessible guestroom, #2, an accessible forward reach to access the light sockets behind the night table is not provided. This is in violation of sections 308.2.2 & 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff's ability to access the receptacles independently.

f. In the accessible guestroom, #2, the light by the bed and the lights above the desk are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of sections 309.3 and 806.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

g. In the accessible guestroom, #2, the operable part of the window controls requires tight grasping, pinching, or twisting of the wrist.

This is in violation of sections 309.4 and 806.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

h. In the accessible guestroom, #2, the window controls are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of sections 309.3 and 806.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

i. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the folding shower seat in the roll-in shower is not adjacent to the controls. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

j. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the folding shower seat in the roll-in shower is too far from the compartment entry. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

k. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the shower spray unit in the roll-in shower does not have an on/off control with a non-positive shut-off. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility.

l. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the shower spray unit in the roll-in shower is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility.



m. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, in the bathroom, the hair dryer is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of sections 404.2.7 and 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

n. Appropriate stairway handrail extensions are not provided. This is in violation of section 505.10.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304.

o. An accessible route is not provided to access the ballroom. This is in violation of section 206.2.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to the facility. 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202, §36.304.

p. The plaintiff was discriminated against by hotel for not offering equal access to the hotel's ballroom as the hotel offers these amenities to able individuals. This is in violation of 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202, §36.211 & §36.304.

q. Accessible seating at the tables and bar inside and outside the hotel at the Glenmorgan Bar & Grill is not provided to a person using a wheelchair. Also, tables are too high in the ballroom. This is in violation of sections 226 and 902 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. This condition denied the Plaintiff access to any of the tables and bars around the hotel; 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202, §36.304.

r. In the spa toilet compartment an object is too close to the rear grab bar by the water closet. This is in violation of section 609.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

s. A clear width is not provided to access the changing room in the spa. This is in violation of section 404.2.3 of the 2010 Standards for



Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

t. An appropriate size bench is not provided in changing room in the spa. This is in violation of section 903.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

u. The mirror in the lobby bathroom is too high. This is in violation of section 603.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

v. In the lobby toilet compartment, the toilet paper dispenser underneath the side grab bar is spaced to close to the side grab bar by the water closet. This is in violation of section 609.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

w. In the lobby toilet compartment, the flush control is on the narrow side of the water closet. This is in violation of section 604.6 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

x. In the lobby toilet compartment, the baby changer and the toilet seat cover dispenser are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition denied the Plaintiff to access the facility independently.

y. In the accessible toilet room by the 595 entrance, the toilet compartment door does not have pulls on both sides of the door. This is in violation of section 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access

the facility.

z. In the accessible toilet room by the 595 entrance, in the toilet compartment an object is too close to the rear grab bar by the water closet. This is in violation of section 609.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

aa. The hook on the door in the accessible toilet compartment by the 595 entrance is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202 & §36.304. This condition denied the Plaintiff to access the facility independently.

bb. An appropriate maneuvering clearance is not provided to properly access the ice machine and the vending machine. This is in violation of section 305.7 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility independently.

cc. Appropriate designations are not provided by the accessible guest room, Jolie Boutique, and other permanent spaces. This is in violation of section 216.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304.

dd. An accessible portion for hotel check-in counter, which is too high, is not provided to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 904 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility independently.

ee. The access aisle does not adjoin an accessible route to the site. This is in violation of section 502.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the

Plaintiff access to the facility.

ff. Parking space identification is missing from some of the accessible parking spaces. This is in violation of section 502.6 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff access to the facility.

gg. In the accessible guestroom, #2, an accessible forward reach to access the light sockets behind the night table is not provided. This is in violation of sections 308.2.2 & 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff's ability to access the receptacles independently.

hh. In the accessible guestroom, #2, the light by the bed and the lights above the desk are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of sections 309.3 and 806.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

ii. In the accessible guestroom, #2, the operable part of the window controls requires tight grasping, pinching, or twisting of the wrist. This is in violation of sections 309.4 and 806.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

jj. In the accessible guestroom, #2, the window controls are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of sections 309.3 and 806.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

kk. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the folding shower seat in the roll-in shower is not adjacent to the controls. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards

for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

ll. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the folding shower seat in the roll-in shower is too far from the compartment entry. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

mm. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the shower spray unit in the roll-in shower does not have an on/off control with a non-positive shut-off. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility.

nn. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the shower spray unit in the roll-in shower is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility.

oo. In guestroom #2, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, in the bathroom, the hair dryer is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of sections 404.2.7 and 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility independently.

pp. Appropriate stairway handrail extensions are not provided. This is in violation of section 505.10.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304.

qq. An accessible route is not provided to access the ballroom. This is in violation of section 206.2.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to

the facility. 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202, §36.304.

rr. The plaintiff was discriminated against by hotel for not offering equal access to the hotel's ballroom as the hotel offers these amenities to able individuals. This is in violation of 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202, §36.211 & §36.304.

ss. Accessible seating at the tables and bar inside and outside the hotel at the Glenmorgan Bar & Grill is not provided to a person using a wheelchair. Also, tables are too high in the ballroom. This is in violation of sections 226 and 902 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. This condition denied the Plaintiff access to any of the tables and bars around the hotel; 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202, §36.304.

tt. In the spa toilet compartment an object is too close to the rear grab bar by the water closet. This is in violation of section 609.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

uu. A clear width is not provided to access the changing room in the spa. This is in violation of section 404.2.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

vv. An appropriate size bench is not provided in changing room in the spa. This is in violation of section 903.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

ww. The mirror in the lobby bathroom is too high. This is in violation of section 603.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

xx. In the lobby toilet compartment, the toilet paper dispenser underneath the side grab bar is spaced to close to the side grab bar by the water closet. This is in violation of section 609.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

yy. In the lobby toilet compartment, the flush control is on the narrow side of the water closet. This is in violation of section 604.6 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

zz. In the lobby toilet compartment, the baby changer and the toilet seat cover dispenser are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition denied the Plaintiff to access the facility independently.

aaa. In the accessible toilet room by the 595 entrance, the toilet compartment door does not have pulls on both sides of the door. This is in violation of section 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

bbb. In the accessible toilet room by the 595 entrance, in the toilet compartment an object is too close to the rear grab bar by the water closet. This is in violation of section 609.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility.

ccc. The hook on the door in the accessible toilet compartment by the 595 entrance is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202 & §36.304. This condition denied the Plaintiff to access the facility independently.

ddd. An appropriate maneuvering clearance is not provided to properly access the ice machine and the vending machine. This is in violation of section 305.7 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility independently.

eee. Appropriate designations are not provided by the accessible guest room, Jolie Boutique, and other permanent spaces. This is in violation of section 216.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304.

fff. An accessible portion for hotel check-in counter, which is too high, is not provided to a person in a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 904 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the Plaintiff to access the facility independently.

11. All of the foregoing cited violations are violations of both the 1991 Americans with Disabilities Act Guidelines (ADAAG) and the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, as adopted by the Department of Justice.

12. The discriminatory violations described in Paragraph 10 are not an exclusive list of the Defendant's ADA violations. Plaintiff requires the inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and all of the barriers to access. The individual Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly-situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied the benefits of services, programs and activities of the Defendant's facilities, and have otherwise been discriminated



against and damaged by the Defendant because of the Defendant's ADA violations, as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly-situated will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

13. Defendant have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying her access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its place of public accommodation or commercial facility in violation of 42 USC § 12181 *et seq.* and 28 CFR. 36.302 *et seq.* Furthermore, the Defendant continue to discriminate against the Plaintiff, and all those similarly-situated by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

14. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law and is suffering irreparable harm. Considering the balance of hardships between the Plaintiff and Defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted. Furthermore, the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses from the Defendant pursuant to 42 USC § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

15. Defendant is required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled, when such removal is readily achievable for its place of public accommodation that has existed prior to January 26, 1992, 28 CFR 36.304(a); in the alternative, if there has been an alteration to Defendant's place of public accommodation since January 26, 1992, then the Defendant is required to ensure to the maximum extent feasible, that the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use walkers and wheelchairs, 28 CFR 36.402; and finally, if the Defendant's facility is one which was designed and constructed for first occupancy subsequent to January 26, 1993, as defined in 28 CFR 36.401, then the Defendant's facility must be readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities as defined by the ADA.

16. Notice to Defendant is not required as a result of the Defendant's failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if

Defendant have 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff or waived by the Defendant.

17. Pursuant to 42 USC § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to require the Defendant to alter the The Radnor Hotel to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other persons with disabilities as defined by the ADA; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendant cure its violations of the ADA. The Order shall further require the Defendant to maintain the required assessable features on an ongoing basis.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff respectfully requests:

a. The Court issue a Declaratory Judgment that determines that the Defendant at the commencement of the subject lawsuit are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq.

b. Injunctive relief against the Defendant including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facility; or to make such facility readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require the Defendant to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such

modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

c. An award of attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 USC § 12205.

d. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: April 5, 2021

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Dessen, Esq. (I.D. 17627)

Dessen, Moses & Rossitto

600 Easton Road

Willow Grove, PA 19090

Telephone: 215.496.2902

Facsimile: 215.658.0747

[ddessen@dms-lawyer.com](mailto:ddessen@dms-lawyer.com)

and

Lawrence A. Fuller, Esq., *pro hac vice*  
*pending*

Fuller, Fuller & Associates, P.A.

12000 Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 502

North Miami, FL 33181  
Telephone: 305.891.5199  
Facsimile: 305.893.9505  
[lfuller@fullerfuller.com](mailto:lfuller@fullerfuller.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Helen Swartz*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

**DESIGNATION FORM**

*(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)*

Address of Plaintiff: c/o Lawrence A. Fuller, 12000 Biscayne Blvd., N. Miami, FL 33181

Address of Defendant: Radnor Hotel Associates, 595 East Lancaster Ave., Ste. 303,

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: The Radnor Hotel, 591 E. Lancaster Ave., St. Davids, PA

**RELATED CASE, IF ANY:**


Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Terminated: \_\_\_\_\_

Civil cases are deemed related when **Yes** is answered to any of the following questions:

- |  |                              |  |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?            | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case ☐ is / ☒ is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 04/05/2021

  
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff

17627

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

**CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)**

**A. Federal Question Cases:**

- ☐ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
- ☐ 2. FELA
- ☐ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- ☐ 4. Antitrust
- ☐ 5. Patent
- ☐ 6. Labor-Management Relations
- ☒ 7. Civil Rights
- ☐ 8. Habeas Corpus
- ☐ 9. Securities Act(s) Cases
- ☐ 10. Social Security Review Cases
- ☐ 11. All other Federal Question Cases

(Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:**

- ☐ 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- ☐ 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- ☐ 3. Assault, Defamation
- ☐ 4. Marine Personal Injury
- ☐ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- ☐ 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 7. Products Liability
- ☐ 8. Products Liability – Asbestos
- ☐ 9. All other Diversity Cases

(Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION**


*(The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)*

I, David S. Dessen, Esq., counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:

☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:

☒ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 04/05/2021

  
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff

17627

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM**

HELEN SWARTZ, Individually,  
v.  
RADNOR HOTEL ASSOCIATES

CIVIL ACTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

:

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

**SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:**

- (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ( )
- (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( )
- (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ( )
- (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ( )
- (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ( )
- (f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. (X)

April 5, 2021  
Date

David S. Dessen  
Attorney-at-law

Plaintiff  
Attorney for

215-658-1400  
Telephone

215-658-0747  
FAX Number

ddessen@dms-lawyer.com  
E-Mail Address